

REMARKS

Status of Claims

Claims 18, 23, 24, 47 and 54 are amended. Claim 59 is newly added. No new matter is added. Claim 22 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 56-58 were previously canceled. Thus, claims 18, 20, 23-27, 47, 49, 54 and 59 are pending in the application. A detailed listing of all claims that are in the application, is presented, with appropriately defined status identifiers.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103

In the Advisory Action, the rejection of claims 18, 20, 22-27, 47, 49 and 54 was maintained. The rejection was based, in part, on the disclosure of Guan et al. ("Guan," U.S. Patent No. 7,334,048). (See, e.g., Advisory Action, paragraph 13).

In the Final Office Action, claims 18, 20, 22-26, 47, 49 and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Somasundaram et al. ("Somasundaram," U.S. Patent No. 7,334,049). Claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Somasundaram and further in view of Inoue et al. ("Inoue," U.S. Patent No. 7,103,663).

As previously noted, claim 22 is canceled. Therefore, the rejection of claim 22 is rendered moot.

The rejection of claims 18, 20, 23-27, 47, 49 and 54 is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 18

Regarding independent claim 18 (and independent claims 47 and 54), the Examiner contends:

. . . However, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would [readily] appreciate the priority field in a router update such as taught by Guan . . . being used in a router/NAT device such as taught by Somasundaram . . . Guan describes typical route tables entries with respect to updating the routes, which would be an inherent action within the system of

[Somasundaram], as the router/NAT device would also function as a router. (Advisory Action, paragraph 13).

Applicants respectfully traverse these contentions in that claims 18, 47 and 54 are believed to be patentable over the cited references.

However, to expedite issuance of this application as a patent, Applicants have amended claim 18 to recite features similar to those previously recited in now-canceled claim 22. That is, claim 18 is amended to recite:

wherein the packet transfer device further comprises a user information obtaining unit which obtains attribute information regarding a sender of a name resolution request message transmitted from said client to said name resolution server,

wherein said DNS proxy unit, upon receiving said name resolution request message, obtains said attribute information regarding the sender of said name resolution request message through said user information obtaining unit and transmits said name resolution request message with said attribute information added to said name resolution server[.]

Regarding claim 22, the Examiner stated: “Applicant further argues with respect to claim 22 that Somasundaram does not teach obtaining user attribute information and argues that obtaining a user address is not attribute information.” (Advisory Action, paragraph 13). Further, the Examiner contended: “Examiner disagrees, as a sender address is information regarding an attribute of the sender.” (Advisory Action, paragraph 13).

Applicants respectfully traverse this contention. As previously explained in Applicants’ Amendment of January 12, 2009, Applicants respectfully submit that Somasundaram’s disclosure regarding the revealing of a “private address” does not disclose or suggest obtaining attribute information.

However, to expedite issuance of this application as a patent, Applicants have amended claim 18 to further recite additional features. In more detail, claim 18 is amended to recite:

wherein said attribute information includes at least one of a login identifier of the sender, information identifying a geographic location of the

sender, information identifying a type of a sender device used by the sender in sending the name resolution request message, and information identifying a type of a network coupling the sender device to the name resolution server.

Applicants respectfully submit that Somasundaram does not disclose or suggest the above-noted features of claim 18. For example, Somasundaram's disclosure regarding the revealing of a "private address" does not disclose or suggest:

wherein said attribute information includes at least one of a login identifier of the sender, information identifying a geographic location of the sender, information identifying a type of a sender device used by the sender in sending the name resolution request message, and information identifying a type of a network coupling the sender device to the name resolution server[,]

as recited in claim 18.

Further, it is believed that none of the other cited references addresses the distinctions of claim 18 over Somasundaram.

At least for the reasons explained, it is believed that claim 18 is patentable over the cited art.

Claims 20 and 23-27 depend from claim 18. At least for this reason, it is believed that claims 20 and 23-27 are patentable over the cited art.

Independent Claim 47

As amended, claim 47 recites, among other features:

wherein said computer-readable instructions are further configured to cause the computing device to obtain attribute information regarding a sender of a name resolution request message transmitted from said client to said name resolution server and to transmit said name resolution request message with said attribute information added to said name resolution server,

wherein said attribute information includes at least one of a login identifier of the sender, information indicating a geographic location of the sender, information indicating a type of a sender device used by the sender in sending the name resolution request message, and information indicating a type of a network coupling the sender device to the name resolution server.
(Emphasis Added).

At least for reasons similar to those explained with respect to claim 18, it is believed that claim 47 is patentable over the cited art.

Claim 49 depends from claim 47. At least for this reason, it is believed that claim 49 is patentable over the cited art.

Independent Claim 54

As amended, claim 54 recites, among other features:

wherein said method further comprises:

obtaining attribute information regarding a sender of a name resolution request message transmitted from said client to said name resolution server; and

transmitting said name resolution request message with said attribute information added to said name resolution server, and

wherein said attribute information includes at least one of a login identifier of the sender, information indicating a geographic location of the sender, information indicating a type of a sender device used by the sender in sending the name resolution request message, and information indicating a type of a network coupling the sender device to the name resolution server. (Emphasis Added).

At least for reasons similar to those explained with respect to claim 18, it is believed that independent claim 54 is patentable over the cited art.

New Claim

It is believed that new independent claim 59 recites features that are neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited references.

New independent claim 59 recites:

A packet transfer method of transferring a plurality of packets from a destination to each of a plurality of clients, said method comprising:

receiving, at a packet transfer device, a first name resolution response message transmitted from a name resolution server to a first client of said

clients, said first name resolution response message including a first IP address corresponding to said destination and one or more first packet transfer information fields;

receiving, at the packet transfer device, a second name resolution response message transmitted from the name resolution server to a second client of said clients, said second name resolution response message including a second IP address corresponding to said destination and one or more second packet transfer information fields, said second IP address being different from said first IP address;

rewriting a routing table to include said first and said second IP addresses and said one or more first and said one or more second packet transfer information fields;

controlling said transfer of said packets from said destination to said first client according to said first IP address and said one or more first packet transfer information fields; and

controlling said transfer of said packets from said destination to said second client according to said second IP address and said one or more second packet transfer information fields. (Emphasis Added).

Therefore, favorable consideration of claim 59 is respectfully requested.

Concluding Remarks

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment instructions in EFS-Web being incorrect or absent, resulting in a rejected or incorrect credit card transaction, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under

37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 3/6/09 By Norman (Reg. No. 58,941)

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6014
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

for George C. Beck
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,072